

WARREN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

COMMITTEE: COUNTY FACILITIES

DATE: FEBRUARY 1, 2011

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: OTHERS PRESENT:

SUPERVISORS MCCOY
THOMAS
VANNESS
GIRARD
BELDEN

JEFFERY TENNYSON, SUPERINTENDENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
FRANK MOREHOUSE, SUPERINTENDENT OF BUILDINGS
BILL CASEY, SIEMENS BUILDING TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
DANIEL G. STEC, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD
PAUL DUSEK, COUNTY ATTORNEY/ADMINISTRATOR
JOAN SADY, CLERK OF THE BOARD
KEVIN GERAGHTY, BUDGET OFFICER
SUPERVISORS CHAMPAGNE
MONROE
TAYLOR
WOOD
DON LEHMAN, *THE POST STAR*
CHARLENE DIRESTA, SR. LEGISLATIVE OFFICE SPECIALIST

Mr. McCoy called the meeting of the County Facilities Committee to order at 11:52 a.m.

Motion was made by Mr. Thomas, seconded by Mr. Girard and carried unanimously to approve the minutes of the previous Committee meeting, subject to correction by the Clerk of the Board.

Privilege of the floor was extended to Frank Morehouse, Superintendent of Buildings, who distributed copies of the agenda packet to the Committee members; *a copy of the agenda packet is on file with the minutes.*

Commencing with the agenda review, Mr. Morehouse requested to rescind Resolution No. 582 of 2008 which authorized an agreement with the lowest responsible bidder regarding modernization of the existing elevators at the Warren County Municipal Center, due to expiration of the bids.

Motion was made by Mr. Thomas, seconded by Mr. Belden and carried unanimously to rescind Resolution No. 582 of 2008 as outlined above. *A copy of the resolution request form is on file with the minutes and the necessary resolution was authorized for the February 18, 2011 Board meeting.*

Mr. Morehouse requested to amend Resolution No. 741 of 2010 which ratified the actions of the Chairman of the Board in executing an agreement with Evergreen Testing & Environmental Services regarding in-place density testing at the former Social Services Building, in order to increase the amount not to exceed from \$1,106 to \$1,598.

Motion was made by Mr. Girard, seconded by Mr. Belden and carried unanimously to amend Resolution No. 741 of 2010 as outlined above. *A copy of the resolution request form is on file with the minutes and the necessary resolution was authorized for the February 18, 2011 Board meeting.*

Concerning relocation of Department Offices, Jeffery Tennyson, Superintendent of the Department of Public Works (DPW), reported that relocation of the Board of Elections (BOE) Offices was a primary concern with a target deadline of April 1, 2011. He stated the contracted architect had been requested to review the safety systems and had submitted a Letter of Authorization, a scope of work and a budgetary estimate with anticipated commencement of construction by mid-February. Mr.

Tennyson said the Buildings & Grounds Department had reviewed the bill of materials and would order as necessary. He advised that once the BOE Offices were relocated, they would commence with the relocation of the remaining departments and he would update the Committee at the next meeting. He noted that routine maintenance and inclement weather could factor into the completion date of the relocation of the departments. Mr. McCoy stated that the BOE had advised that they needed to be fully relocated by April 1, 2011.

Mrs. Wood expressed her concern with the amount of construction dust that had been present when she last visited the Planning & Community Development Department. She asked if it was possible to block off the construction area. Mr. Morehouse responded that he intended to tent the construction area once they began sheetrocking and the dust was probably the result of one wall which had been demolished.

Pertaining to the Referrals List, Mr. Morehouse recommended that the following items be deleted: Item No. 1 pertaining to lead and asbestos abatement in the old Jail; Item No. 2 pertaining to the New York State Building Codes Law; and Item No. 3 pertaining to the possibility of converting the old Jail into temporary housing.

Mr. Monroe referred to Item No. 1 and questioned if part of the relocation plan was to move a portion of the Probation Department to the former Sheriff's wing. Paul Dusek, County Attorney/Administrator, reported that he had received a letter from Judge Krogmann, Supreme Court Judge, requesting the space currently occupied by the Probation Department, as well as the Computer Training Room on the first floor and he had expressed interest in the kitchen area of the old Jail. Mr. Dusek advised there would be a walk-through of the locations with the Court representatives to determine which offices would relocate to which area. He suggested the item be deleted for the time being as the issue would be brought back to the Committee at the appropriate time. Brief discussion ensued pertaining to the presence of asbestos in the area.

Mr. Monroe stated that the Office of Court Administration (OCA) contracted with their own architect although he was unsure if they had a contracted engineer. Mr. Girard agreed that the Courts required additional space; however, he stated the County's intent had been to turn the space over to the Courts and once they had possession of the space for a predetermined period of time, it was their obligation to pay for the necessary renovations. Mr. Dusek agreed with Mr. Girard's statement as it pertained to the space currently occupied by the Probation Department; however, he explained, if the Courts were to take possession of the old Jail, the space would not be usable until the lead and asbestos was abated.

Mr. Morehouse recommended that Item No. 4 pertaining to the possibility of using grant funding for lead and asbestos abatement in the old Jail and Item No. 5 pertaining to an investigation on the cost of renovating the old Jail into a homeless housing facility be deleted from the Referral List.

Referring to Item No. 6 pertaining to the building currently occupied by the WIC (Women, Infants and Children) Office, Mr. Morehouse stated that once all of the Department relocations were completed, the WIC Building would most likely be demolished. He suggested the Item be deleted from the Referral List. Mr. Tennyson said the Building would be re-evaluated in the Spring to determine the best course of action. He stated that the County had not reviewed the possibility of selling the building "as is" or the possibility of investing a small amount of funds in order to improve the property for sale. He noted the funds to complete an asbestos and hazard survey or demolition of the building had not been budgeted for 2011. Mr. Belden advised that fuel costs for the building had been eliminated from the 2011 budget, as it had been anticipated that the WIC Offices would

be relocated by the beginning of 2011. Mr. Tennyson agreed that the relocations had been anticipated to be completed by the beginning of 2011; however, he added, the inclusion of the BOE in the relocations had caused unanticipated delays. Mr. McCoy suggested Item No. 6 remain on the Referral List.

Mr. Morehouse commented that Item No. 7 pertaining to the construction of a carport for the Office of Emergency Services (OES) vehicles, should remain on the Referral List. Mr. Tennyson said that his last conversation with Brian LaFlure, Director of the OES/Fire Coordinator, had pertained to preliminary engineering design and the amount of space required. Mr. Tennyson stated the DPW would develop a cost estimate and the funds would be budgeted for 2012.

It was the consensus of the Committee to delete Item Nos. 1 through 5 from the Referral List and to carryover Item Nos. 6 and 7.

Mr. Tennyson introduced Bill Casey, of Siemens Building Technologies, Inc., who would present the Committee with an Energy Performance Assurance Report for Year 1 and Year 2. Mr. Tennyson noted this was an annual review that was a requirement of the contract with Siemens.

Mr. Casey reviewed the Energy Performance Assurance Reports for Year 1 and Year 2 in detail noting that with the exception of the dollar figures, the two reports gave essentially the same information. He stated the main focus of the project had been to replace the heat pumps and improve the heating and cooling systems of the Municipal Center Building. He reported that from an energy savings standpoint the project had been an overall success. He noted that Siemens had guaranteed a savings of \$221,728 for Year 1 and a verified savings \$238,250 had been realized, an additional savings of \$16,522. He continued that Siemens had guaranteed a savings of \$229,851 for Year 2 and a verified savings \$246,967 had been realized, an additional savings of \$17,116.

Mr. Casey stated the domestic hot water boiler had been replaced with a tankless hot water boiler. He reported that a 93% efficient unit was supposed to have been installed; however, he added, the unit that was installed was 80% efficient which had resulted in less savings than had been anticipated. He noted the annual guaranteed savings for domestic hot water boiler replacement had been \$1,742 and the verified savings had been \$934, a difference of \$808 which he attributed to the installation of the less efficient unit. He said it was unknown at this time why the decision had been made to install the less efficient unit; however, he stated, an engineer from Siemens would work with the County to determine if a change order had been completed.

Another variance from the original contract, Mr. Casey pointed out, was the night set back and cool down of the heating system. He explained the contract stipulated that the building would be occupied from 6:30 a.m. to 6:30 p.m. and would be unoccupied for the remainder of the time. He further explained the unoccupied temperature set points listed in the contract were 78 degrees in the summer and 55 degrees in the winter and the occupied temperature set points were 72 in the summer and 69 in the winter. He said the actual average winter set point was 72.1 degrees which was 3.1 degrees warmer than the set point designated in the contract and had a negative effect on the amount of realized savings. He pointed out that the actual average summer set point was 74.1 degrees which was slightly warmer than the contracted set point of 72 degrees and had a positive effect on the amount of realized savings. The greatest factor in the amount of realized savings, he continued, was the actual average unoccupied winter set point of 71.8 which was 16.8 degrees warmer than the contracted set point of 55 degrees.

Mr. Monroe asked if there were controls in place that monitored and corrected the temperature set points and Mr. Casey responded that the system had initially been set up with those controls in place; however, he noted, the Board had adopted a resolution (Resolution No. 741 of 2009 which was adopted at the November 20, 2009 Board meeting) to set the thermostats of the Municipal Center to the settings which had been in place the previous winter due to occupant complaints. Mr. Morehouse stated that it had been determined that the system was not capable of reheating the building to the appropriate temperature by 8:00 a.m. He added that a technician from Siemens had worked with the Buildings & Grounds Department staff and had determined that 72 degrees was a preferable temperature set point for the winter. He noted there had been several months of trial and error to determine the proper set point and there had been an issue with employees using personal space heaters in their offices. Mr. Morehouse commented that the Department staff would meet later today with Siemens technicians to determine a more suitable set back procedure. He advised that Mr. Dusek had volunteered his Office to be used as a test area for the new procedure.

Mr. Casey announced that the test area would be used to initiate a start/stop optimization procedure which factored in the outdoor air temperature to determine the length of time necessary for the building to reach the desired temperature by the appropriate time. He advised that implementing the start/stop optimization procedure would increase the realized savings; although, he continued, the savings might not be the amount originally guaranteed under the existing contract.

Mr. Girard asked Mr. Dusek if the Energy Performance Assurance Report was acceptable and Mr. Dusek responded that with the exception of the hot water boiler replacement and the temperature set point issues, the savings had been in excess of the guaranteed amount. Mr. Dusek advised it was necessary to determine why a less efficient hot water boiler had been installed and added that if the error had been on the part of Siemens, the County would look to Siemens to correct it. He stated it was also necessary to determine who was responsible for the temperature set point issue. He said he was unsure why the County had agreed to a nighttime winter set back temperature of 55 degrees at 6:30 p.m. when there were cleaning staff occupying the building until midnight. He said that Siemens had indicated that they would work with the County at no additional cost, to determine the best course of action.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Dusek announced that the test area for the start/stop optimization procedure would be the entire second floor of the Municipal Center and the procedure would be initiated today. He said once the proper settings for the second floor were determined the remainder of the building would be included.

Mr. Tennyson pointed out the four important points derived from the Reports were as follows:

- the assistance of Siemens in the implementation of a start/stop optimization system relative to temperature set points;
- the experimentation to determine the appropriate temperature set points;
- the inquiry to determine the reason behind the installation of a less efficient tankless hot water heater (80% versus 93%); and
- addressing the issue of defective heat pumps with the manufacturers.

Pertaining to defective heat pumps, Mr. Tennyson reported, the Buildings & Grounds staff had replaced many of the drip pans on the heat pumps and had made repairs on a regular basis. He added they were looking for a pattern to determine if there were units that were defective and Siemens had agreed to contact the manufacturer pertaining to any defective units.

Mr. Dusek suggested that the Committee accept the Siemens Energy Performance Assurance Report on the conditions outlined by Mr. Tennyson. He advised that the report be accepted, reserving the County's rights as they pertained to the savings derived from temperature set points. He explained that if Siemens had developed a system that under no circumstances would have been capable of maintaining the set points established by the contract, then the County would look to Siemens to correct the issue. On the other hand, he continued, if the failure had been caused by the County, then it was their responsibility to make the necessary corrections.

Motion was made by Mr. Thomas, seconded by Mr. Girard and carried my majority vote, with Mr. Belden voting in opposition, to accept the Siemens Energy Performance Assurance Reports for Year 1 and Year 2 contingent on the results of an inquiry to determine the reason behind installation of a less efficient tankless hot water heater; reserving the County's rights pertaining to savings derived from temperature set points; Siemens assisting the County in the implementation of a start/stop optimization system relative to temperature set points; and with the assumption that Siemens would work with the County in addressing the issue of defective heat pumps with the manufacturers. *The necessary resolution was authorized for the February 18, 2011 Board meeting.*

As there was no further business to come before the County Facilities Committee, on motion made by Mr. Girard and seconded by Mr. Belden, Mr. McCoy adjourned the meeting at 12:48 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Charlene DiResta, Sr. Legislative Office Specialist